I: Ammar E, I-5 (1951) 1954
MR13 Fellahin MR13
Silwa

potential friction in the new situation; and to the extent they are in harmony he can be secure in his new status. Many marriages actually break down because of the friction between parents, sisters or brothers, and wife or mother-in-law. This seems to be a common feature of patriarchal societies where the main emphasis is not on marriage as such, but on its wider social implications, being an institution relating two families and whose foundation is not 'romantic love' but having children.[1]

Such instances, and many others, show the delicacy of the relations in the kinship pattern. It is worth noticing that such delicacy is more on the paternal than the maternal side where the scope or the manifestations of tension are not so wide or numerous. Although such friction amongst kin is a valid element in their behaviour towards each other, it cannot obviate certain corporate structural symbols of social behaviour. If, for instance, a man is attacked or publicly insulted, his brother or cousin must stand with him in spite of whatever conflicts are hitherto outstanding. If an uncle dies, his cousins must attend the burial ceremony and 'passionately' mourn him. Gifts and money must be exchanged on occasions such as circumcision and wedding irrespective of the nature of personal relationship. Absence from the village is not an excuse for not performing one's obligations. Villagers in towns or cities have to mourn publicly their deceased in cafés or other places where others from Silwa, residing there, come to condole with them. On their return to the village they must perform the mourning rituals for close kin by weeping on their way from the station to the house, or if the deceased is a distant relative, by visiting his people, in spite of the lapse of time. On the whole, severing personal relationship for any reason does not necessarily mean ignoring one's corporate relationships by forfeiting any of the rights or shirking any of the duties.

Cutting across these bilateral kinship ties is a flow of inter-personal relationships which are not caught up in corporate bonds. This is what Professor Fortes designates as ties of 'cognatic kinship'. Cognatic ties are in contradistinction to agnatic ties, which primarily stress the corporate duties and rights and the solidarity of the social groupings, at the expense of the individual's private interests. Cognatic ties both within and across the kinship system differ from the agnatic in one important respect. In Fortes' words: 'They are ties of amity and mutual interest between individuals. Private rights and duties and personal loyalties prevail as against corporate rights. They represent the recognition that the direct social bonds of individual with individual are as vital for the wellbeing of the society as the fixed framework of corporate groupings. This sense of interdependence of men as individuals in the hard struggle of ordinary living, not only transcends the more rigid solidarities of the family, lineage . . .

[1] See Talcott Parsons, 'The Kinship System of the Contemporary United States', in *American Anthropologist*, Vol. XLV, 1943.

1: Ammar E, I-5 (1951) 1954
MR13 Fellahin MR13
Siwa

608 but also counteracts the friction and disturbances that constantly spring up in the relations of individuals with one another.'[1]

The adoption of Fortes' distinction and its implication is not arbitrary in this context, as it coincides almost completely with the two categories of relationship in the village. The agnatic kinship ties correspond to the 'Karaib' category while cognate kinship ties correspond to the 'Habaib' category. As one co-operates, for example, with relatives, one also selects a distantly related person or group, calling them 'Habaib', to co-operate with, and in this case a kinship term might be given to him or them as 'cousins'. The two categories are clearly distinguished in the sphere of mutual obligations, for in the case of cognatic ties, misunderstanding and friction would stop that form of social duties between the two sides.

[1] M. Fortes, *The Web of Kinship*, pp. 343–4.